

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed July 13, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 12, 2000; June 17, 2002; July 17, 2002; August 14, 2002; January 27, 2003; August 21, 2003; December 8, 2003; June 1, 2004; November 26, 2004; December 17, 2004; May 25, 2005; November 25, 2005; December 1, 2005; May 30, 2006; November 27, 2006; and April 4, 2007.

A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 14, 25-38 and 51-64 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Although the Office Action Summary omits claims 13 and 14 from the list of pending claims, the Applicant notes that claims 13 and 14 are, in fact, pending. Claims 25-38 and 51-64 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new claims 65-77 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 14 and 65-77 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 2, 65 and 71 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In response to a request in paragraph 3 of the Official Action, the Applicant will correct any errors in the specification of which the Applicant becomes aware.

Paragraph 5 of the Official Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13, 14 and 25-38 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,909,114 to Yamazaki and U.S. Patent No. 6,238,754 to Shohara. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie*

case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite a pixel electrode over a resin film. For the reasons provided below, Yamazaki '114 and Shohara, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

The pixel electrode 218 of Shohara is not over the resin film 230. Also, Yamazaki '114 does not appear to disclose a color layer provided between a protecting film and a resin film or a pixel electrode over the resin film. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki '114 and Shohara, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 2.

Since Yamazaki '114 and Shohara do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Official Action rejects claims 51-64 as obvious based on the combination of Yamazaki, Shohara and U.S. Patent No. 6,835,607 to Takemura. In response, claims 51-64 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, the rejections are moot.

New claims 65-77 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Claims 65, 66 and 72 are supported in the present specification, for example, by Figures 11 and 15B. Also, claim 71 recites features that are similar to claims 1 and 65. Claims 66-70 are dependent claims of claim 65, and claims 72-77 are dependent claims of claim 71. The Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 65-77 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Pilaud
Reg. No. 53,470

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789